

<p>Criterion #6: No Significant Disruption of the Educational Programs</p>

State Criteria: The proposed unification will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the affected districts and will continue to promote sound educational performance in those districts, ref. Education Code Section 35753(a)(6). Section 18573(a)(3), Title 5, California Code of Regulations, states that, "In analyzing the proposal or petition, the California Department of Education shall describe the district-wide programs, and the school site programs, in schools not a part of the proposal or petition that will be adversely affected by the proposal or petition."

A new Southeast Area district would also have to comply with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, in accordance with the Hayden Criteria in Education Code Section 35730.1(f). (Note: Compliance would become an obligation of the new school board.)

Analysis: Various factors impacting student achievement were studied in order to determine whether or not unification in the Southeast Area would significantly disrupt the educational program of the pupils in the Southeast Area and the pupils within a reorganized LAUSD, and continue to promote sound educational performance. Comparisons were made between quality and quantity of educational factors within the targeted Southeast study area and the total Los Angeles Unified School District.

Our analysis is organized into the following categories:

- **Student Performance Data**
 - Academic Performance Index (API)
 - Average Score Comparison
 - Growth Targets
 - Actual Growth
 - Sub-group achievement
 - Awards
 - Demographics
 - Secondary School Achievement
 - Advanced Placement
 - SAT/CAT
 - CSU/UC Requirements
- **Program Accountability Reviews**

- **Educational Program**
 - Curriculum
 - Instructional Offerings
 - Core Program
 - Differentiated Instruction (GATE, magnet, special education, alternative education, advanced placement/honor classes)
 - Intervention Opportunities
 - Assessment Program
- **Quality of Staff**
 - Credentialing
 - Professional Development

Student Performance Data

Academic Performance Index:

The Academic Performance Index (API) is the statewide measure of student achievement and allows for comparisons among districts and schools as a whole as well as for significant subgroups (15% or more of the student population). The Index reflects performance for grades 2-12 on the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), a norm-referenced test, which was augmented during the most recent administration (Spring, 2001) by standards-based items in Reading/Language Arts (STAR Program).

The following elements are reported on the A.P.I.:

- Percent of students tested
- School wide score
- Growth Target for the school and each significant subgroup
- Achievement from previous year's scores
- Attainment of school and subgroup target(s)
- Eligibility of performance awards

Appendix C-1 presents results for the schools in the feasibility study while Appendix C-1B reflects the results for the entire Los Angeles Unified School District. The Pulliam Group (subcontractor to NNW) compared the gains made by the study area schools to those in the total Los Angeles Unified School District (Appendix C-2).

The school API mean score in the target area (Local District J and the three schools in Local District I) was lower than the average LAUSD API score depicted in Appendix C-3. The average LAUSD API score for 2001 was 70.4 points higher at the elementary level, 60.19 points higher at middle and 61.63

points higher at the high school level. However, the actual achieved improved score, which is summarized on the next page, indicates that the schools within the study area achieved higher average gains than were noted in LAUSD.

AVERAGE Actual Growth on the Academic Performance Index Spring, 2000 to Spring, 2001			
	Elementary (K-5)	Middle (6-8)	Sr. High (9-12)
Feasibility Study Schools	56.93	32.67	13.00
Total L.A.U.S.D.	39.97	12.10	-.24

Source: California Department of Education

The percentage of schools meeting the minimum school wide target set by the State (5% of the difference between the previous year's API score and the desired score of 800) in the Feasibility Study area was greater at all levels as reflected in the following:

PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS MEETING SCHOOL WIDE TARGET Spring, 2000 to Spring, 2001			
	Elementary (K-5)	Middle (6-8)	Sr. High (9-12)
Feasibility Study Schools	96%	67%	67%
Total LAUSD	89%	45%	20%

Source: California Department of Education

Significant ethnic, language, and socio-economic sub-groups also showed a greater percentage of gain in the area of study. At the elementary level, 96% of the schools met their sub-group target while 89% of all schools in L.A.U.S.D. had this result. Within the feasibility study, middle and senior high schools also exceeded the percentage of schools that met sub-group targets when compared to LAUSD on Appendix C-4.

Throughout the State, schools that met the school wide and sub-group targets on the Academic Performance Index, are deemed "awards eligible." When comparing the schools in the study area to the larger Los Angeles Unified School District, the following data was revealed:

Percent Eligible for A.P.I. Awards (up to \$150 per A.D.A. statutory)			
	Elementary	Middle	Sr. High
Feasibility Study Schools	96%	67%	67%
L.A.U.S.D. Total	75%	28%	6%

Source: California Department of Education

It is noteworthy that sub-group data accounts for and equalizes demographic factors, which research has indicated impacts student achievement, second language learners and socio-economic indicators (percent receiving "free and

reduced meals”, parent education levels and student mobility). Demographic data for the study schools are found in Appendix C-5.

First grade scores throughout the entire district reached an average percentile score of 56 – an increase of 14%. Previously, the District has never scored above the 50th percentile. Elementary grades exceeded the average statewide growth in reading, math, language and spelling. The greatest increases were noted by the Hispanic/Latino students that comprise 70% of LAUSD and close to 100% of the schools in the feasibility area.

Secondary School Achievement:

The following additional achievement indicators demonstrate student learning at the secondary level:

- Advanced Placement Tests (Appendix C-6)
- SAT/CAT (Appendix C-7)
- Completion of UC/CSU Entrance Requirements (Appendix C-7)

Los Angeles Unified School District, when compared to Los Angeles County and the State, has more students (25%) taking the Advanced Placement Tests as well as a higher percentage of students that receive a score of 3 or higher. Although the percentage of students taking the exam(s) in the feasibility study area exceeded the County and the State, the percentage receiving a score of 3 or above was less than the District, County, and State.

More of the Los Angeles Unified School District’s 12th graders take the SAT and/or CAT for college entrance than is reported in the County and the State. Nevertheless, the actual scores (averages) fall below those achieved at the County and State levels. The scores obtained by the Grade 12 students in the study area fall below those achieved by their LAUSD, County, and State counterparts. It is noteworthy that the three Senior High Schools in the study area test a larger percentage of students on the ACT.

Grade 12 students of Hispanic/Latino heritage were used to compare the percent of students completing all courses required for UC/CSU Entrance. Seventy percent of LAUSD and close to 100% of the study area students claim Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. As is noted in Appendix C-8, 32.3% of the students in LAUSD meet requirements. This percentage is larger than the State (21.5%) and the County (25.9%). One school, Bell Senior High, in the study area has 36.4% who complete all CSU/UC courses. The other two senior high schools scored below the District, County and State averages.

Program Accountability Review(s)

The schools in the feasibility study, as part of the Los Angeles Unified School District, conduct Coordinated Compliance Reviews (CCR) as well as the Program Quality Reviews (High School PQR or “Focus on Learning (FOL) Joint Process” for WASC accreditation outlined on the Consolidated Application).

During 1999/00 eleven CCR’s were held in the feasibility study area. A review of the findings revealed a very high degree of compliance in the examined areas as reflected on the table that follows.

School	# of Areas Examined	# of Areas in Compliance	Areas Out of Compliance	# of Sub-Categories in Area	# of Sub-Areas Out of Compliance
Nimitz	9	7	English Learners	21	3
			GATE	6	4
Hughes	9	8	Migrant Ed.	9	1
Heliotrope	9	9	None		
Fishburn	9	7	GATE	6	1
			Consolidated Programs	22	1
Elizabeth	9	7	GATE	6	2
			Consolidated Programs	22	2
Corona	9	5	English Learners	21	1
			GATE	6	3
			Migrant Ed.	9	1
			Safe Schools	3	1
Bell High	9	7	GATE	6	2
			Cons. Pr.	45	1
Loma Vista	9	7	Gender Equity	21	1
			Safe Schools	3	1
Park Ave	9	9	None		
Woodlawn	9	8	Gender Equity	21	1
Nueva Vista	9	9	None		

Source: 1999 Coordinated Compliance Reviews

In addition to the compliance reviews, two schools participated in the Planning Phase of the Intermediate Intervention/Under-performing Schools Program

(II/USP) while one school became a school wide Title I School. All schools scheduled for accountability reviews completed the comprehensive planning process to focus strategies to improve student achievement.

Accountability reviews are unaffected by district organization and would continue as per state and federal requirements.

Current Educational Program

In 2000/01 the Los Angeles Unified School District implemented “A Multiple Plan for Transforming the LAUSD into Eleven Local Districts with One Mission.” The mission for schooling has been centralized and consistent with the State’s Accountability Program of 1999, which began and continues to establish content standards for Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, Science, and English Language Development.

LAUSD’s guiding principles for change included the following:

- Focus on improving student achievement, especially reading at this time.
- Develop a new LAUSD culture that holds everyone responsible for achievement from the classroom to the boardroom.
- Engage parents in the mission of educating their children.
- Provide local communities with more control over and more access to their schools.
- Tap the expertise of our best educators to support schools throughout LAUSD.

The schools in the Feasibility Study, as part of the greater Los Angeles Unified School District, have embraced the California State standards. Literacy/Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics were focus areas for the 2000-01 school year and continue to be emphasized during the current school year. Content standards are being translated to performance standards for all students.

When the Superintendent for local District J, which contains the vast majority of the feasibility study schools, was asked about the increased achievement enjoyed by the schools in his district, he identified the following curricular factors:

- Focus on reading, writing, and mathematics
- Adoption/Implementation of California/LAUSD Content Standards
- Standards which drive the teaching/learning work:
 - Narrative Account (Writing)
 - Response to Literature (Reading)
 - Functions in Algebra as a K-9 conversation (Mathematics)
- Use of the Principles of Teaching and Learning (Lauren Resnick) with

initial focus on:

- “Accountable Talk”
- Clear Expectations
- Academic Rigor in a Thinking Curriculum

While the above-cited factors are implemented in each local district, the Superintendent of Local District J mentioned that his local district had implemented the “Walk Through’s” earlier than the other districts. The “Walk Through’s” examine the classroom evidence of the Principles of Teaching and Learning in a collaborative fashion; including site and district administrators, teachers, support personnel, and community members. The emphasis on the K-12 standards-based classroom was also mentioned as a contributor to enhanced student performance.

Educational gains for the schools in the feasibility study could be continued with consistent implementation and extension of the above-mentioned curricular factors now in place. Of course, radical changes to the mission and the guiding principles, if a new school board desired those, have the potential of interrupting the momentum of the educational program.

Instructional Offerings

The Core Instructional Programs document cites “to improve student learning to enable all students to achieve high academic standards “ as a primary goal for all students in the Los Angeles Unified School District. To reach this goal, the highest instructional priorities are:

- Improved student reading and writing skills across all grade levels;
- Improved student skills and understanding in mathematics across all grade levels; and
- Focused professional development as the key to improving classroom practices.

The document further describes the core program, including strategies to address the need of English Learners and Standard English learners. All instructional efforts are aligned to the California State Standards and are integrated with Lauren Resnick’s “Principles of Learning” and the District’s work with the Institute for Learning – University of Pittsburgh.

A dramatic change for LAUSD has been the change in the delivery of professional development strategies that are job embedded and incorporate the following: initial training, coaching, lesson study, inquiry groups and on-line professional development. Initial training in reading, math, and the Principles of Learning have been provided and funded by LAUSD. Each elementary school has a site-based literacy coach who works collaboratively with teachers to provide on-going support. Math coaches have been added for the 2001-2002

school year. These coaches have also been funded by the LAUSD. Local districts and schools supplement the LAUSD's professional development and support personnel through categorical and other discretionary funds.

The Core Program throughout the K-12 system of Los Angeles Unified School District and the schools in the Feasibility Area consists of standards-based materials, as described:

Elementary Schools

CORE SUBJECT	MATERIALS
Reading	➤ Open Court (K-5) ➤ Waterford (K-1)
Writing	➤ Open Court
Language Development	➤ Into English
Mathematics	➤ Harcourt MATH

Source: LAUSD.

These standards based materials are currently in place and are not due to be changed until the next statewide adoption cycle for language arts and math. There would be no change in standards based materials for students within the reorganized districts.

Could a Southeast Area school district retain the current program of instructional offerings, including professional development, post unification? Yes, if the resources were allocated in a manner similar to LAUSD by the new district's governing board.

Secondary Schools: Middle and Senior High

The systemic improvement effort that has been implemented at the K-5 level and appears to have made a positive impact on student achievement, is currently being extended through the secondary schools.

As part of the Secondary Literacy Plan, LAUSD has organized instruction according to the California State Content Standards to give all students in the middle and senior high school the opportunity to meet or exceed grade level content standards. Adoption of textbooks in all content areas that are aligned with the California State Content Standards is ongoing.

Cadres of teachers, representing all secondary content areas, are currently designing standards-based content lessons to deliver explicit and strategic instruction to enable student to learn specific content while learning to read, write, speak and problem solve in a given discipline. The lessons will also include performance standards for students and define mastery. Secondary

literacy coaches will also be identified to replicate the successful elementary model of professional collaboration through modeling, coaching, and reflective practice.

Instructional Time

A challenge for the Los Angeles Unified School District is overcrowding. All schools within the feasibility study area are on a year-round, multi-track calendar. Although the Concept 6 calendar provides only 163 days of instruction, rather than the 180 days provided in a traditional calendar, total instructional minutes equal or exceed the State requirements at all levels as follows:

Grades	District (LAUSD)	State
Kindergarten	36,023	36,000
1-3	55,909	50,400
4-5	55,909	54,000
6-8	66,667	54,000
9-12	66,667	64,800

Source: LAUSD.

Differentiated Instruction

Within a standards-based environment, students who attend schools in the study area have access to instructional programs to meet varying interests, learning styles and rates. There are seven math/science magnet schools and one magnet program focusing on the visual/performing arts. The magnet programs have open enrollment and transportation is provided free of charge by the District. One hundred percent of the students attending the eight magnet schools represent the local district's attendance area. These students would not be affected by reorganization. However, the students who attend magnet schools in other areas of the Los Angeles Unified School District would have to request release and an inter-district transfer from the newly formed district to continue at their present magnet school. While the new district might be reluctant to release these students because of the loss of revenue, inter-district agreements could be made to allow the students to continue at their school of choice or the program could be replicated in the Southeast Area.

Other offerings, such as Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) and special education are generally provided at neighborhood or local schools. One school serves 251 students (ages 3 through 21) with severe disabilities while the remainder of the special education population is served within the regular school setting. In addition, there is one K-12 Alternative School with 1,443 students and two Continuation High Schools that serves 175 students during the 2000-01 school year. These students, for the most part, reside within the attendance area of the feasibility study.

Transportation is provided for special education students. Therefore, services would be continued with reorganization. There could, perhaps, be added costs if not all attendance area students' special needs could be met within the new district. Interagency agreements could be made between the newly formed district and LAUSD as well as with other agencies to continue to serve the needs of these students.

When one examines the Advanced Placement (AP) Classes at the secondary level, the average number of AP classes offered at LAUSD senior high schools is 24.5, while the average for the high schools in the feasibility study is 32.

**ADVANCED PLACEMENT CLASSES
2000-2001**

School/District	Number of classes	Average of All School in LAUSD
Bell	45	
Huntington Park	22	
South Gate	29	
LAUSD		24.5

Source: LAUSD.

Students in the feasibility study area enrolled in upper level math and science classes in grades 11 and 12 were not only compared to their counterparts in LAUSD, but data were also available for County and State comparisons. The complete data is represented on Appendix C-9.

There is some variability in the offerings with the enrollment/availability among feasibility area schools. Huntington Park Senior High has no enrollment in Introduction to Algebra and very limited enrollment in Physics, while South Gate Senior High reports no enrollment in Physics. It is, however, noteworthy that the Los Angeles Unified School District's enrollment in the upper level math and science classes is generally comparable and surpasses the County and State in First Year Chemistry.

Students within the Southeast Area would continue to have access to advanced placement and other opportunities for differentiated instruction.

Intervention Opportunities

LAUSD's priority is the effective teaching first aligned to the California Content Standards delivered through a comprehensive and balanced instructional program in all classrooms. First interventions are made in the classroom. For example, at the elementary level the District has adopted the Waterford Early Reading Program as an in-class intervention program for all students in Kindergarten and Grade 1 and second graders participating in the District's

Intensive Academic Support (IAS) program where class size is lowered to 10 students.

A second level of intervention at elementary and secondary levels is offered through the Extended Learning Program (ELP) to provide an opportunity for more intensive instruction for students who are at risk of not meeting grade level standards. The following interventions are included:

- Extended learning programs
- Summer school
- Intersession
- Intervention materials and strategies aligned to specific student needs
- Bridging Program for identified 5th and 8th grade students

The content of the Intervention Programs are generally designed at the local school and could be continued post-unification at least at the current level. Intersession opportunities are limited throughout many of the local LAUSD districts due to overcrowding and the need to have a year-round multi-track calendar. This dilemma would not change with reorganization unless additional facilities were secured.

Assessment Program

In addition to State mandated tests, i.e. Stanford 9/STAR, Aprenda, California English Language Development Test (CELDT), and the High School Exit Exam, the Los Angeles Unified School District provides on-going assessment of students at every level in order to inform instruction and to measure student progress toward mastery of content standards. The following formative assessments are used throughout the year:

- ELD Portfolios
- Performance Assignments (Writing)
- Interim assessments in Reading and Math
- End of unit/course Assessments
- Examination of daily student work
- Teacher (cadre) observation and reflection
- Diagnostic Assessments

The central LAUSD office for all local districts prescribes the first three assessments listed. The formative assessments should continue post-unification, since these are currently embedded with the language arts and math texts. The manner in which formative assessments are used to guide the instruction for students is currently a local decision and would presumably continue as well.

Quality of Staff

Credentialing:

While LAUSD lists “too many non-credentialed teachers” as a challenge, 73% of the District’s teachers are fully credentialed with many holding supplementary certification to teach English learners. In the feasibility study schools, 70% of the teachers are fully credentialed and 30% of the teachers are employed via an Intern or Pre-Intern Credential, Emergency Permit, or Waiver. However, the percentage of non-credentialed teachers in the Southeast area may change if more credentialed teachers elect to remain with LAUSD and/or the new Southeast Area district has difficulty recruiting fully credentialed teachers, as further explained in the following.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement with the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) provides lifetime health benefits. Comments from UTLA indicated that 80% of the teachers would choose to stay with LAUSD. This indicator has been validated by the charter school experiences. Teachers have remained with the charter school during the three years for which they have guaranteed replicated benefits. However, at the end of the three years, they have generally chosen to return to a non-charter school.

Within the UTLA Agreement, teachers choose tracks, grade levels, and schools by seniority. A recent amendment allows principals to provide for parity among tracks between credentialed and emergency credentialed teachers. In a Southeast Area district, there may be an initial cost saving to a new district if veteran teachers exercised their seniority right to choose other positions within LAUSD. However, the cost to the Southeast Area district would be the loss of teaching experience and added teacher training.

Professional Development:

A dramatic change for Los Angeles Unified School District has been the change in professional development strategies. Effective professional development is job embedded and incorporates the following: initial training, coaching, lesson study, inquiry groups, and on-line professional development.

A district wide training program has been outlined and is being provided to support the Core Instructional Programs. All training is aligned to the California State Standards and is integrated with the “Principles of Learning” and the District’s collaboration with the Institute for Learning (University of Pittsburgh).

Professional Development is ongoing and systemic throughout the total Los Angeles Unified School District. On-site coaches are trained by Coach Coordinators. Site and District administrators participate fully in all staff

development content, so that the standards-based programs and best instructional practices will become institutionalized throughout LAUSD.

Incorporating elements of “The Principles of Learning” in all professional development activities are intended to ensure system-wide understanding and instructional practices that is core to the standards-based instructional programs of the LAUSD.

If the new district in the Southeast Area wishes and has the resources, it could fund the same training by brokering with LAUSD or replicating and extending current services.

Summary and Conclusions

The Los Angeles Unified School District has embarked on an ambitious effort to systematically reform the educational program so that all students will master the California Content Standards. Although the District has formed eleven local districts, the mission of improved student achievement is clearly articulated, and all resources have been allocated to achieve the goal.

LAUSD has embraced the State standards as well as designating power standards for each content area. Instructional materials are standardized at each level and are standards-based. Professional development, including ongoing coaching by on-site coaching personnel, is consistent throughout the District, is aligned to the content standards and correlated with the Lauren Resnick’s “Principles of Learning”.

The first year of implementation of the “Multiple District Plan for Transforming the Los Angeles Unified School District “ appears to have resulted in improvement in student achievement – particularly at the elementary school level where maximum efforts and resources were expended. The middle schools and senior high schools are in the process of replicating the apparently successful improvement processes used by the elementary schools.

The Los Angeles Unified School District has identified the following five challenges:

- Students who are learning English as a second language
- Overcrowding of schools
- Too many non-credentialed teachers
- Lack of consistency and focus of teacher professional development
- Lack of trust from the community to improve student achievement

The District has outlined and begun a comprehensive, systemic program to meet the challenges. Student achievement as measured by the Academic Performance Index clearly shows gains, except at the senior high school level.

Students at the secondary level, however, demonstrate comparability with County and State peers in many areas leading toward college/university attendance.

The journey has begun. Research informs that systemic change takes three to five years. Initial steps appear to have a positive impact on student achievement and employee accountability.

Education Code 35753 requests examination of the positive and negative impacts of a proposed reorganization. Based on review of the data of the educational program, the following conclusions are cited:

Educational Gains Possible

- The Academic Performance Index gains demonstrated by the schools in the feasibility study exceeded those of LAUSD. Perhaps this momentum would be sustained if the local district were independent of the larger District.
- The Superintendent of Local District J, that contains most of the study schools, has been at the forefront of the implementation on “The Principles of Learning”. With his focused leadership, should he be retained post unification, the local district might see additional student achievement gains.
- The Southeast Cities for Educational Empowerment (SECEDE) is comprised of civic leaders concerned about public education and more local control of the schools. Reorganization may provide the local communities with additional control over and more access to their schools. A stronger community partnership could enhance the educational program by providing additional fiscal resources as well as human resources, i.e. mentoring, tutoring, internships.
- The newly formed district which would be smaller and locally governed could be more responsive to families within the community and engage them more in the mission of educating their children.

Possible Negative Impacts

- At present, there is standardization throughout LAUSD regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Students who move from school to school find themselves with familiar materials, concepts, and at the same point in the district-generated pacing guides. With reorganizations, the educational process of students who move from one district to the

other would be disrupted *if* the educational program were altered in the new district.

- Because of life-time health benefits enjoyed under the present collective bargaining agreement and the benefits of seniority, it would be anticipated that many veteran teachers would choose to stay or (after the initial three year period) return to LAUSD. The new district would have less experienced teachers and more teachers not fully credentialed.
- Students who currently attend magnet programs in another local district may need to return to their school of attendance. These students would have their educational program of choice discontinued or, at least, interrupted unless interdistrict agreements are worked out or the students enter a similar program in the new district.

Overall, LAUSD began making system-wide changes last year, such as adopting standards-based literacy materials. The District has targeted professional development, linked it to standards, and hired literacy coaches for school sites. This year the efforts have extended to math (again including coaches). The effort is led from the central district, i.e. Superintendent Romer's office. There is ongoing accountability as well as training, coaching, and support.

A new district could continue, replicate and even enhance the educational program given sufficient fiscal and human resources. A greater concern of this author is the nature of change, transition management, and the political nature of school boards. New leadership at any level (school board, superintendent, principal) typically desires to put its own stamp on the system. If this is done without carefully examining the current program, it could negatively impact the students, the research base, and the viability of new programs and practices.

Any change, whether positive or negative, will interrupt the continuity of the educational program for students who can ill afford to lose any time in meeting State standards to pass the High School Exit Exam which will soon be required for high school graduation. The transition can, of course, be minimized through careful planning.

When one examines the schools who are deemed “under-performing” by the State of California through the Intermediate Intervention for Under-performing Schools (II/USP) and High Priority Grant Programs (HPGP); most have no or little system-wide standards-based programs and practices. While individual teachers, departments, and grade levels are delivering a consistent, effective educational program to students, the following barriers generally impact student learning:

- Lack of articulated and shared mission for schooling
- Too many materials and programs

- Lack of or inconsistent focus on State standards
- Professional Development/Coaching unrelated to student needs
- Supplementary programs not coordinated to classroom instruction
- Lack of standards-based assessment data to guide instruction
- No time for teachers to analyze data and plan instruction and interventions
- Little district support for individual school needs

The Los Angeles Unified School District is in its second year of mitigating these barriers through its systemic program to insure a focus on standards, assessment, and accountability. The effort has produced a more focused school and district effort on those elements that characterize a standards-based school.

The effect of reorganization of the educational program of a newly formed district depends on the decisions made by its leaders rather than the fiscal and human resources available to continue and/or enhance the current programs and services.

Consultant's Conclusion: Based on the data provided by the district, California Department of Education data and NNW's analysis, the proposed unification will not significantly disrupt the educational programs in the affected districts and will continue to promote sound educational performance in those districts, if the newly-unified Southeast Area district continues an educational direction that is as focused and effective as that exhibited by LAUSD.